

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.Ol Bek 1450 Alexadria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,158	04/19/2001	Karen Mae Holland	ARC000018US1	8446
48146	7590 07/19/2006		EXAM	INER
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/837,158	HOLLAND ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
James H. Blackwell	2176	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires ______months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: ___ Claim(s) rejected: __ Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the prior art combination of Lewak and Goldman fail to teach the limitation of "identifying a relationship between a structured variable and text documents included in a category based on a probability of occurence of a combination of the structured variable and said category as claimed in Claims 1, 14, 17, and 23. More specifically, Applicant argues that the references are not combinable because Lewak discloses accessing computer files, while Goldman discloses examining a text collection of data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and argues that both are analyzing unstructured files containing content. Applicant further argues that whether alone, or in combination, that these references fail to teach the limitation of i"dentifying a relationship between a structured variable and text documents included in a category based on a probability of occurrence of a combination of said structured variable and said category". More specifically, the Applicant argues that Goldman fails to teach this limitation, and in particular the notion of a "structured variable". The Examiner respectfully disagrees and argues that Goldman does disclose a structured variabe with respect to the Earthquake data, even if it may not be precise times. Examiner further argues that morning as opposed to evening does distinguish different times of day with respect to the occurrence of Earthquakes. Applicant further argues that the combination of Lewak, Goldman, and Goldszmidt with respect to claims 3-12, 14-16, 18-22, and 24 are not combinable and even if they were would not teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and argues that Goldszmidt does relate to the limitations of at least the independent claims and the skilled artisan would have also known that clustering would have likely been a component used in the prior arts of Lewak and Goldman as part of the analysis. In all of these arguments, Applicant suggests that at least the combinations discussed above could only be made in view of impermissable hindsight. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and argues that the prior art discussed above is believed to teach the necessary steps that when combined would render the claimed limitations obvious.

> WILLIAM BASHORE PRIMARY EXAMINER